REMARKS

In the present application, claims 1-37 are pending. Claims 1-8 and 29-37 are withdrawn. As a result of this response, claims 9-28 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 11-16, and 18-28 as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US 2003/0036354 A1) in view of Zumudzinski et al. (US 2004/0128310 A1). With regards to independent claims 9, 16, and 23, the Examiner asserted that Lee et al. disclose a device arrangement comprising a first device of a cellular network (see fig. 1, mobile unit 140), which device has a transmitter (see fig. 1), a receiver (see fig. 1) and a control unit (see fig. 1), as well as means for utilizing Bluetooth properties (see fig. 1, Bluetooth module 142), and a second device (see Fig. 1, laptop 110 and par. 0024) having a user interface (laptop having user interface is well known in the art, see fig. 1 of Zumudzinski et al. ... and means for utilizing Bluetooth properties arranged to communicate with the first device by Bluetooth (see fig. 1). Lee et al. does not mention wherein the activity state of the user interface utilization in the second device is arranged to control the level of the Bluetooth power save mode wherein active user interface utilization is arranged to decrease said level of the power save mode. However, Zumudzinski et al discloses an activity state of the user interface utilization in the second device is arranged to control the level of the Bluetooth power save mode wherein active user interface utilization is arranged to decrease said level of the power save mode and/or less active user interface utilization is arranged to increase said level of the power save mode (see fig. 1 and pars. 0021 and 0025)." The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious "to modify the above teaching of Zumudzinski et al to Lee et al. in order to control power saving properties to the wireless device."

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions. Specifically, Applicants argue that numerous elements of claims 9, 16, and 23 are not taught or otherwise disclosed by Lee et al. or Zumudzinski et al. taken singularly, and as a result, their combination, such a combination neither suggested nor deemed appropriate, similarly fails to disclose such elements.

Claim 9 recites:

9.A device arrangement comprising a first device (30) of a cellular network, which device has a transmitter (33), a receiver (32) and a control unit (34), as well as means for utilizing Bluetooth properties, and a second device (38) having an user interface (36) and means for utilizing Bluetooth properties arranged to communicate with the first device (30) by Bluetooth, wherein the activity state of the user interface utilization in the second device is arranged to control the level of the Bluetooth power save mode wherein active user interface utilization is arranged to decrease said level of the power save mode and/or less active user interface utilization is arranged to increase said level of the power save mode.

Lee et al. discloses, generally, a device arrangement comprising a first device of a cellular network having a means for utilizing Bluetooth properties and a second device arranged to communicate with the first device via Bluetooth. Lee et al. is further directed, in general, to achieving power conservation through the synchronization of Bluetooth and wireless wakeup times as described at paragraph [0011]. Lee et al. makes no disclosure or mention of an activity state in the second device controlling a Bluetooth power save mode as recited in claim 9. The Examiner is therefore correct when asserting that Lee et al. "does not mention wherein the activity state of the user interface utilization in the second device is arranged to control the level of the Bluetooth power save mode wherein active user interface utilization is arranged to decrease said level of the power save mode."

Applicants, however, disagree with the Examiner's assertion that Zumudzinski et al. discloses that an activity state of the user interface utilization is arranged to control the level of the Bluetooth power save mode as claimed. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, it is not disclosed, at the Examiner's citations or elsewhere, that the level of a Bluetooth power save mode is controlled, particularly by an activity state of the user interface utilization. At the Examiner's citation of paragraph [0021], it is merely recited that a "PDA 100 can then enter a low-power sleep mode until awakened by the user or by

a signal from telephone 200." At the Examiner's citation of paragraph [0025], it is simply stated that "PDA 100 can be either active or in sleep mode awaiting a Bluetooth wake-up command."

It is therefore evident that neither Lee et al. nor Zumudzinski et al., individually teach or suggest an activity state of a user interface utilization controlling the level of the Bluetooth power save mode as claimed. As a result, their combination, such a combination neither suggested nor deemed appropriate, likewise fails to teach these elements of claim 9. For at least this reason, claim 9 is in condition for allowance. As independent claims 16 and 23 likewise recite limitations similar to those discussed with respect to claim 9 above, they are likewise in condition for allowance. As all of claims 11-15, 18-22, and 24-28 depend upon claims 9, 16, and 23, they are likewise in condition for allowance.

Despite claims 12, 14, 19, 21, 25 and 27 being in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above, Applicants further note that the Examiner is in error when citing paragraphs [0021] and [0025] as disclosing "wherein said activity state of the user interface utilization is defined by the state of at least one of the following in the second device: the lock state of a lockable keypad, the lock state of a lockable touch sensitive display, the state of a screensaver, the lock state of a lockable screensaver and the state of a lid or an opening mechanism of the device". In fact, there is no mention made of these features in either of the Examiner's citations.

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 17 as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Zumudzinski et al. and in further view of Myhre et al (US 2004/0203737 A1). Applicants respectfully note that Myhre does not disclose, nor does the Examiner assert that it does disclose, an activity state of a user interface utilization controlling the level of the Bluetooth power save mode as claimed. As a result, the combination of the three, such a combination neither suggested nor deemed appropriate, likewise fails to teach this element. As a result, claims 10 and 17 are in condition for allowance.

An earnest and thorough attempt has been made by the undersigned to resolve the outstanding issues in this case and place same in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone or personal interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues which remain in this application after

consideration of this amendment, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone the undersigned and the same would be gratefully appreciated.

It is submitted that the claims herein patentably define over the art relied on by the Examiner and early allowance of same is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

21 Apr 06

Jeffrey R. Ambroziak — Date

Reg. No.: 47,387

Customer No.: 29683
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400
Facsimile: (203)944-0245
email: jambroziak@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

4/21/2006 — Elaine F. Mason

Date — Name of Person Making Deposit